

AD-A216 330

4

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Contract N00014-86-K-0043

TECHNICAL REPORT No. 118

Strongly Coupled One-Dimensional System and the Polymer

by

Xin Sun, Chang-qin Wu, Rouli Fu, Duo Liang Lin and Thomas F. George

Prepared for Publication

in

Proceedings of the Yamada Conference on Strongly Coupled Plasma Physics

Edited by S. Ichimaru

Tokyo, Japan, 1989

Departments of Chemistry and Physics
State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York 14260

November 1989

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the
United States Government.

This document has been approved for public release and sale;
its distribution is unlimited.

DTIC
ELECTE
DEC 07 1989
S E D

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS	
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE				
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) UBUFFALO/DC/89/TR-118			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Depts. Chemistry & Physics State University of New York		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)		7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Fronczak Hall, Amherst Campus Buffalo, New York 14260			7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Chemistry Program 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Office of Naval Research		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER Contract N00014-86-K-0043
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Chemistry Program 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217			10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.
			TASK NO.	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Strongly Coupled One-Dimensional System and the Polymer				
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Xin Sun, Chang-qin Wu, Rouli Fu, Duo liang Lin, and Thomas F. George				
13a. TYPE OF REPORT		13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) November 1989
15. PAGE COUNT 5				
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Prepared for publication in Proceedings of the Yamada Conference on Strongly Coupled Plasma Physics, Edited by S. Ichimaru, Tokyo, Japan, 1989				
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	ONE-DIMENSIONAL POLYMERS	
			CONTROVERSY	
			STRONG ELECTRON CORRELATION	
			DIMERIZATION	
			INSTABILTY	
			CONDUCTING POLYMERS	
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) What is the effect of the electron interaction on the lattice instability of one-dimensional systems with strong electron correlation is a controversial problem. One side believes the electron interaction enhances the instability; but the other side declares the instability is reduced by the electron interaction. The origin of this controversy is analysed in this paper, and we find that the range of the electron interaction plays a decisive role. When the range is long, the electron interaction enhances the lattice instability, whereas, if the range is short, the electron interaction reduces the instability. Based on this conclusion, we can clarify the dispute about the effect of the electron interaction on the dimerization of the conducting polymers.				
20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Dr. David L. Nelson			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (202) 696-4410	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL

STRONGLY COUPLED ONE-DIMENSIONAL SYSTEM AND THE POLYMER

Xin SUN* Chang-qin WU*, Rouli FU[§], Duo Liang LIN[†], and Thomas F. GEORGE[†]

* Lab for Solid State Microstructure, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210008; and
Department of Physics, Fudan university, Shanghai 200433, China^(a)

[§] Lab for Infrared Physics, Academia Sinica, Shanghai 200081, China

[†] Department of Physics and Astronomy, State University of New York at Buffalo,
Buffalo, New York 14260

What is the effect of the electron interaction on the lattice instability of one-dimensional systems with strong electron correlation is a controversial problem. One side believes the electron interaction enhances the instability; but the other side declares the instability is reduced by the electron interaction. The origin of this controversy is analysed in this paper, and we find that the range of the electron interaction plays a decisive role. When the range is long, the electron interaction enhances the lattice instability, whereas, if the range is short, the electron interaction reduces the instability. Based on this conclusion, we can clarify the dispute about the effect of the electron interaction on the dimerization of the conducting polymers.

1. INTRODUCTION

For a one-dimensional system, due to the electron-lattice interaction, a proper modulation of the lattice can always make the boundary of the Brillouin zone coincide with the Fermi surface. Then, a gap is opened on the Fermi surface. This gap will lower the energy, and a lattice distortion results from such modulation. It is ^{the} so-called Peierls instability, which is the peculiarity of one-dimensional systems. If the band is half filled, this instability will cause the dimerization, which produces the bond alternation of the polymers. In many one-dimensional systems, such as the conducting polymers, the electron correlation is strong. Then, an important question is asked: is the lattice instability enhanced or reduced by the electron-electron interaction? It has attracted considerable attention.¹⁻⁶ So far the extended Hubbard model

$$H_H = U \sum_{i,\sigma} n_{i,\sigma} n_{i,-\sigma} + V \sum_{i,\sigma,\sigma'} n_{i,\sigma} n_{i-1,\sigma'} \quad (1)$$

is used to describe the electron interaction. And many different techniques, such as ^{the} renormalization group,¹ Gutzwiller variational calculation,² Monte Carlo simulation,³ valence bond method,⁴ etc., have been used to investigate the effect of electron interaction on the dimerization. These studies reach the same result that the dimerization is greatly enhanced by electron interaction. Furthermore, they conclude that the main origin of the dimerization is the electron-electron interaction rather than the electron-lattice interaction.

2. DISPUTE

However, this conclusion is challenged recently by Kivelson, Su, Schrieffer and Heeger (KSSH),⁷ who argue that the repulsive interaction between electrons should be unfavorable to deviate from the uniform structure. Then they declare an opposite opinion that the electron interaction has to reduce the dimerization. KSSH point out that the extended Hubbard model only contains site-charge repulsion, which is the diagonal part of the Coulomb interaction, missing the bond-charge repulsion

$$W C_{i,s}^+ C_{i+1,s} C_{i,s}^+ C_{i+1,s} \quad , \quad (2)$$

which is one of the off-diagonal terms of the Coulomb interaction. By adding such W term to the extended model, they show the dimerization can be suppressed by the electron interaction. But the other side presents opposite comments on KSSH's theory and insists the original opinion.⁸

Obviously, the divergence of these two sides lies in the different descriptions of the electron interaction. One side only takes the diagonal terms U, V of Coulomb interaction, and the other side adds one more term W . Since the site-charge repulsion U, V and the bond-charge repulsion W are some terms of Coulomb interaction, the full interaction between electrons contains many other terms also. Therefore, in order to clarify this dispute, we should start the study from a general electron interaction — the screened Coulomb potential

$$v(r) = \frac{U_0}{\sqrt{1 + (r/a)^2}} \exp(-\beta r/a) \quad , \quad (3)$$

where U_0 and β are the strength and the screening factor of the interaction. This general interaction includes all diagonal and off-diagonal terms. Actually, in the second quantized representation, the interaction (3) can be written as

$$H' = \sum_{i,j,l,m,s,s'} V(i,j,l,m) C_{i,s}^+ C_{j,s'}^+ C_{l,s} C_{m,s} \quad , \quad (4)$$

$$V(i,j,l,m) = \int dx \int dx' \phi_i^*(x) \phi_j^*(x') v(x-x') \phi_l(x') \phi_m(x) \quad . \quad (5)$$

It is easy to see that $V(i,i,i,i) = U$, $V(i,j,j,i) = V$, and $V(i,j,i,j) = W$. So, the extended Hubbard model and the KSSH's model are different approximations of the interaction (3), and the general interaction (3) can give a reliable answer to the dispute.

3. CORRELATED BASIS FUNCTIONS (CBF) THEORY

The key quantity of a many-electron system is the electron correlation function $g(1,2)$, from which the energy and other properties, including the dimerization u of the system can be obtained. A powerful method to get the correlation function is the CBF theory.¹⁰

Let us denote the non-interacting electron orbit as $\phi_k(x)$. Then, the ground state of the interacting system can be written as

$$\Psi(1,2,\dots,N) = D[\phi_k] \cdot \exp[u(1,2,\dots,N)] \quad , \quad (6)$$

where $D[\phi_k]$ is the Slater determinant and $u(1, 2, \dots, N)$ is the correlation factor, which can be determined by the variational principle. In the case of $\frac{1}{2}$ half-filled band, each atom has only one electron, and the electron density is not high. Meanwhile, there is no electron condensation due to the repulsion between electrons. Then, it is rare for three or more electrons to be gathered closely, and the two-body correlation factor u_{ij} is dominant. In such a case, the correlation function $g(1, 2)$ can be calculated by solving the following equations⁹

$$g(1, 2/\xi) = g(1, 2/0) \exp \int_0^\xi d\xi' K(1, 2/\xi') , \quad (7)$$

$$K(1, 2/\xi) = [u_{12} + \alpha(1, 2) + \alpha(2, 1) + \int d3P(3)h_{12}\alpha(2, 3)] \cdot [\delta(1, 2) + \delta(2, 1) + \zeta(1, 2) + \gamma(1, 2)]/g(1, 2) , \quad (8)$$

$$h_{12} = g(1, 2) - 1 , \quad \alpha(1, 2) = \int d3P(3)h_{13}u_{23} , \quad (9)$$

$$\delta(1, 2) = \int d3P(3)h_{13}h_{23}[u_{13} + \alpha(1, 3) + \alpha(3, 1) + \int d4P(4)h_{14}\alpha(3, 4)] , \quad (10)$$

$$\zeta(1, 2) = \int d3P(3)h_{13}\delta(3, 2) , \quad (11)$$

$$\gamma(1, 2) = \int d3P(3)h_{13}h_{23} \int d4P(4)[u_{34}g(3, 4) + \alpha(3, 4)(1 + h_{34}/2)h_{24} \int d5P(5)h_{45}(u_{45} + \alpha(4, 5)/2)] . \quad (12)$$

4. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

By using the variational principle and the obtaining $g(1, 2)$, we can get the dependence of the dimerization $u(U_0)$ on the interaction strength U_0 for different screening factors β . Our results show there exists a critical value β_c :

1. if $\beta < \beta_c$, the dimerization is initially enhanced by the electron-electron interaction.
2. if $\beta > \beta_c$, the dimerization is reduced by the electron-electron interaction.

In other words, the effect of the electron-electron interaction on the lattice instability depends on the interaction range $\Delta = a/\beta$. The long-ranged interaction will enhance the instability, but the short-ranged interaction will suppress it. For the conducting polymers, $\beta_c \sim 2$.

It is not difficult to understand why the interaction range is the decisive factor to determine the behavior of the lattice instability. First, let us look at the dependence of the ratio W/V on the screening factor β , which is shown in the following table. The ratio W/V monotonically

β	1.0	3.0	5.0	7.0
W/V	0.02	0.10	0.26	0.43

increases with increasing β . Therefore, when the interaction range Δ is long (β is small), the off-diagonal terms are very small and can be neglected. Then the extended Hubbard model is valid, so the dimerization is enhanced by the electron-electron interaction. In the opposite case, Δ is

short (β is big), the off-diagonal terms become important, ^{and} the extended Hubbard model fails. When the bond-charge repulsion and other off-diagonal terms make the dimerization reduced. For the polyacetylene, it can be estimated from the optical gap that its screening factor $\beta_{PA} = 1.7$. Since $\beta_{PA} < \beta_c$, the dimerization of the polyacetylene is enhanced about 25% by the electron interaction.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation of China, Grant 863-715-22, the Office of Naval Research, NSF Grant CHE-8620274 and the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFSC), United States Air Force, under Contract F49620-86-C-0009. The United States Government is authorized to copy and distribute reprints for governmental purposes notwithstanding any copyright notation hereon.

REFERENCES

(a) The permanent address.

1. G.W. Hayden and E.J. Mele, Phys. Rev. B34 (1986) 5484.
2. D. Baeriswyl and K. Maki, Phys. Rev. B31 (1985) 6633.
3. J.E. Hirsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. 51 (1983) 296; D.K. Campbell, T. DeGrand and S. Mazumdar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52 (1984) 1717.
4. Z. Soos and S. Ramasesha, Phys. Rev. Lett. 51 (1983) 2374; S. Mazumdar and S. N. Dixit, Phys. Rev. Lett. 51(1983) 292; P. Tavan and K. Schulten, Phys. Rev. B36 (1987) 4337.
5. S. Kivelson and D. Heim, Phys. Rev. B26 (1982) 4278; H. Fukutome and M. Sasai, Prog. Theor. Phys. 61 (1983) 1.
6. W. Wu and S. Kivelson, Phys. Rev. B33 (1986) 8546.
7. S. Kivelson, W.P. Su, J.R. Schrieffer and A.J. Heeger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 58 (1987) 1899.
8. D. Baeriswyl, P. Horsch and K. Maki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60 (1988) 70; J. Gammel and D.K. Campbell, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60 (1988) 71.
9. C. Wu, X. Sun and K. Nasu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59 (1987) 831.
10. E. Feenberg, *Theory of Quantum Fluids* (Academic, New York, 1969); S. Chakravarty and C.W. Woo, Phys. Rev. B13 (1976) 4815.

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, GEN

	<u>No. Copies</u>		<u>No. Copies</u>
Office of Naval Research Attn: Code 1113 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217-5000	2	Dr. David Young Code 334 NORDA NSTL, Mississippi 39529	1
Dr. Bernard Douda Naval Weapons Support Center Code 50C Crane, Indiana 47522-5050	1	Naval Weapons Center Attn: Dr. Ron Atkins Chemistry Division China Lake, California 93555	1
Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory Attn: Dr. R. W. Drisko, Code L52 Port Hueneme, California 93401	1	Scientific Advisor Commandant of the Marine Corps Code RD-1 Washington, D.C. 20380	1
Defense Technical Information Center Building 5, Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	12 high quality	U.S. Army Research Office Attn: CRD-AA-IP P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709	1
DTNSRDC Attn: Dr. H. Singerman Applied Chemistry Division Annapolis, Maryland 21401	1	Mr. John Boyle Materials Branch Naval Ship Engineering Center Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19112	1
Dr. William Tolles Superintendent Chemistry Division, Code 6100 Naval Research Laboratory Washington, D.C. 20375-5000	1	Naval Ocean Systems Center Attn: Dr. S. Yamamoto Marine Sciences Division San Diego, California 91232	1
		Dr. David L. Nelson Chemistry Division Office of Naval Research 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217	1

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

ABSTRACTS DISTRIBUTION LIST, 056/625/629

Dr. J. E. Jensen
Hughes Research Laboratory
3011 Malibu Canyon Road
Malibu, California 90265

Dr. J. H. Weaver
Department of Chemical Engineering
and Materials Science
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dr. A. Reisman
Microelectronics Center of North Carolina
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina
27709

Dr. M. Grunze
Laboratory for Surface Science and
Technology
University of Maine
Orono, Maine 04469

Dr. J. Butler
Naval Research Laboratory
Code 6115
Washington D.C. 20375-5000

Dr. L. Interante
Chemistry Department
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York 12181

Dr. Irvin Heard
Chemistry and Physics Department
Lincoln University
Lincoln University, Pennsylvania 19352

Dr. K.J. Klaubunde
Department of Chemistry
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

Dr. C. B. Harris
Department of Chemistry
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

Dr. F. Kutzler
Department of Chemistry
Box 5055
Tennessee Technological University
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

Dr. D. DiLella
Chemistry Department
George Washington University
Washington D.C. 20052

Dr. R. Reeves
Chemistry Department
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York 12181

Dr. Steven M. George
Stanford University
Department of Chemistry
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Mark Johnson
Yale University
Department of Chemistry
New Haven, CT 06511-8118

Dr. W. Knauer
Hughes Research Laboratory
3011 Malibu Canyon Road
Malibu, California 90265

ABSTRACTS DISTRIBUTION LIST, 056/625/629

Dr. G. A. Somorjai
Department of Chemistry
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

Dr. J. Murday
Naval Research Laboratory
Code 6170
Washington, D.C. 20375-5000

Dr. J. B. Hudson
Materials Division
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York 12181

Dr. Theodore E. Madey
Surface Chemistry Section
Department of Commerce
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D.C. 20234

Dr. J. E. Demuth
IBM Corporation
Thomas J. Watson Research Center
P.O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

Dr. M. G. Lagally
Department of Metallurgical
and Mining Engineering
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Dr. R. P. Van Duyne
Chemistry Department
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois 60637

Dr. J. M. White
Department of Chemistry
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Dr. D. E. Harrison
Department of Physics
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California 93940

Dr. R. L. Park
Director, Center of Materials
Research
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

Dr. W. T. Peria
Electrical Engineering Department
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dr. Keith H. Johnson
Department of Metallurgy and
Materials Science
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Dr. S. Sibener
Department of Chemistry
James Franck Institute
5640 Ellis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Dr. Arnold Green
Quantum Surface Dynamics Branch
Code 3817
Naval Weapons Center
China Lake, California 93555

Dr. A. Wold
Department of Chemistry
Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island 02912

Dr. S. L. Bernasek
Department of Chemistry
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08544

Dr. W. Kohn
Department of Physics
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92037

ABSTRACTS DISTRIBUTION LIST, 056/625/629

Dr. F. Carter
Code 6170
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D.C. 20375-5000

Dr. Richard Colton
Code 6170
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D.C. 20375-5000

Dr. Dan Pierce
National Bureau of Standards
Optical Physics Division
Washington, D.C. 20234

Dr. R. Stanley Williams
Department of Chemistry
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

Dr. R. P. Messmer
Materials Characterization Lab.
General Electric Company
Schenectady, New York 22217

Dr. Robert Gomer
Department of Chemistry
James Franck Institute
5640 Ellis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Dr. Ronald Lee
R301
Naval Surface Weapons Center
White Oak
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Dr. Paul Schoen
Code 6190
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D.C. 20375-5000

Dr. John T. Yates
Department of Chemistry
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260

Dr. Richard Greene
Code 5230
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D.C. 20375-5000

Dr. L. Kesmodel
Department of Physics
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47403

Dr. K. C. Janda
University of Pittsburgh
Chemistry Building
Pittsburg, PA 15260

Dr. E. A. Irene
Department of Chemistry
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Dr. Adam Heller
Bell Laboratories
Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974

Dr. Martin Fleischmann
Department of Chemistry
University of Southampton
Southampton SO9 5NH
UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. H. Tachikawa
Chemistry Department
Jackson State University
Jackson, Mississippi 39217

Dr. John W. Wilkins
Cornell University
Laboratory of Atomic and
Solid State Physics
Ithaca, New York 14853

ABSTRACTS DISTRIBUTION LIST, 056/625/629

Dr. R. G. Wallis
Department of Physics
University of California
Irvine, California 92664

Dr. D. Ramaker
Chemistry Department
George Washington University
Washington, D.C. 20052

Dr. J. C. Hemminger
Chemistry Department
University of California
Irvine, California 92717

Dr. T. F. George
Chemistry Department
University of Rochester
Rochester, New York 14627

Dr. G. Rubloff
IBM
Thomas J. Watson Research Center
P.O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

Dr. Horia Metiu
Chemistry Department
University of California
Santa Barbara, California 93106

Dr. W. Goddard
Department of Chemistry and Chemical
Engineering
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California 91125

Dr. P. Hansma
Department of Physics
University of California
Santa Barbara, California 93106

Dr. J. Baldeschwieler
Department of Chemistry and
Chemical Engineering
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California 91125

Dr. J. T. Keiser
Department of Chemistry
University of Richmond
Richmond, Virginia 23173

Dr. R. W. Plummer
Department of Physics
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Dr. E. Yeager
Department of Chemistry
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

Dr. N. Winograd
Department of Chemistry
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Dr. Roald Hoffmann
Department of Chemistry
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14853

Dr. A. Steckl
Department of Electrical and
Systems Engineering
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York 12181

Dr. G.H. Morrison
Department of Chemistry
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14853